

Remarks

Claims 1, 2, 4, and 6-12 remain pending. Claim 1 has been amended to be based on the requirements of original claim 5, which has been canceled. No new matter has been added. The sole remaining issue is an anticipation rejection based on an earlier patent to Weismiller.

Claim 1 is directed to a patient table in two sections with two engagement sites on each section such that the second engagement site of each section is an upstanding ledge beneath which the first engagement site of the other section can locate. It is the very nature of an "upstanding ledge" that there will be an edge transverse to the direction of relative motion of the two sections behind which the first engagement site catches.

This is different from what is present in Weismiller. In the brief rejection of claim 5, the Examiner referred to a "ledge 84," which appears to be no more than a smooth surface along which the two section slide. However, a smooth upper surface like surface portion 84 would not be understood as a generally being "a ledge," which is defined by Merriam Webster's Collegiate Dictionary, Tenth Edition as "a raised or projecting edge or molding intended to protect or check." Smooth upper surface 84 lacks the characteristic raised or projecting edge. Furthermore, this inherent characteristic of a ledge has been called out and reinforced by the modifying adjective "upstanding" which has been explicitly added to the language of claim 1.

We note that with respect to claims 6 and 7, the Office action asserted that an underlying recess 96 defined an edge, and surface 152 served as a recess that angled upwardly away from the edge of the ledge. But recess 96 is clearly but a hole through which the retaining pin 152 can project. Significantly, however, it does not appear that recess 96 takes any part in the inter-engagement of the two sections, and certainly there is no way to view a first engagement site of the patient table end section of Weismiller as locating "beneath" part 96. The same applies to retaining pin 152, which seems to be no more than a moveable pin that serves to prevent unintended withdrawal of the device. The actual engagement points of Weismiller, in the sense of two interacting parts that will bear against each other in situ would appear to be the points indicated as A and B in the following:



Thus, the Weismiller reference neither anticipates nor makes obvious the patient table required by claim 1 since none of the structures and surfaces present in Weismiller correspond to the requirements of claim 1 with respect to first and second engagement sites and an upstanding ledge. Claims 2, 4, and 6-12 depend from claim 1 and are allowable for the same reasons.

Applicants hereby request a two month extension of time in accordance with the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.136. A check for the amount of \$430.00 is enclosed for the fee for the two month extension of time. Applicants believe that no further extension of time is required; however, this conditional petition is being made to provide for the possibility that the applicants have inadvertently overlooked the need for a further additional extension of time. If any additional fees are required for the timely consideration of the application, please charge deposit

Application 10/691,858
Filed 10/23/03
Response C to Office action of October 14, 2005

account number 19-4972. In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants believe this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Jay Sandvos
Registration Number 43,900
Attorney for Applicants

BROMBERG & SUNSTEIN LLP
125 Summer Street
Boston, MA 02110-1618
Tel: (617) 443-9292
Fax: (617) 443-0004
02775/00104 471491.1